1893-94

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

REVENUE

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 3rd January 1894

No. 10267-75
R. 1055

Issuing instructions for the guidance of Deputy Commissioners in regard to the appointment of Patels, in supersession of all orders now in force.

M.G.C.P. B.—5-3-95—250

V

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore (Revenue)—dated 3rd January 1894.

No. 10267-75—R. 1055, DATED, BANGALORE, 3RD JANUARY 1894.

ORDER—In supersession of all orders now in force, the Government resolve to issue the following instructions for the guidance of Deputy Commissioners in regard to the appointment of Patels.

2. Generally there should be one Patel for each village recognized as such by the Survey Department, but where the village consisted, prior to the survey, of several villages or hamlets with separate Patels for each of them, the Patels of the several villages which have been clubbed together by the Survey Department, should be allowed to continue to be Patels of those villages or hamlets, and their heirs recognized as their successors. The Government believe that there will be no difficulty in identifying the lands of the several villages clubbed together, but should there be any difficulty in the matter, the Deputy Commissioners are authorized to assign suitable area for each village and hamlet, so that the Patels may be empowered to collect the revenue of those lands and be responsible for all duties connected with them. The Potagi should be divided between the Patels in the proportion of the revenues of the areas assigned or identified as belonging to those villages.

3. Where there are two Hakdars for a single village, the Deputy Commissioners may appoint two Patels, one for Revenue duties and the other for Police duties, and divide the Potagis in the proportion of their shares in the *Hak*. Where there are more than two Hakdars, two of them may be appointed as above directed, and the other Hakdars appointed when vacancies occur, so that all of them may have their turn in office. This rule is of course subject to the condition that the men appointed are fit to hold the office, reside in the village, and hold lands in them.

4. Effect should be given to the above instructions in future on the occurrence of vacancies, and not at once, while the present incumbents are in office unless an appeal in regard to their appointment is pending disposal.

T. ANANDA ROW,
Chief Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.
The Superintendent of Revenue Survey in Mysore.

Exd—K.S.

P. F. 91894

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1894-95

192

(L. R.)

File No. 125 of 94

Serial Nos. 1—19

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—19

Major ~~Part~~ B for January 1897

SUBJECT.

Disputes regarding the patta of Vedagarumkali, Mandy a Taluk

WD 2238—GPB—20,000—11-6-20

Rd.

398

3

Translation of Judgment in Her Miscellaneous Appeal No. 26 of 1894-95 on the file of the Imperial Judicial Court.

Appellant Lidde Sood vs. Respondent Lajpat Rai

This is an appeal against the Kamal Court, Lahore Division dated No. 241 of 12-9-95 rejecting the petition of the petitioner for the grant of Letters of Administration, Karachi Jail.

The plaintiff and the defendant in this case and their pleaders present, were heard, and the proceedings perused, case for Judgment - Plaintiff Sardar Chanan Lidde Sood and the defendant Sardar Lajpat Rai Lidde Sood were first cousins of the village of Gardiwala - Lajpat Rai died in 1895. Sardar Lajpat was a minor at the time Chanan Lidde Sood also

Continued to Central Pacific - In
case they pay for it. Please
let me hear from you -

In 1876 the Republican party
after being in power
since 1860 was defeated
by the Democratic party,
but the Republicans
succeeded in counting
Hayes in - the Democratic
party succeeded in electing
Tilden by 250,000 majority
& the Republicans
declared Hayes elected -
Tilden died soon after
Hayes took office - Claims
Settlement -
Endeavoring to the time of

5

presented a petition requesting that his name might be registered - the Sub-Division officer having enquired into the matter ordered that the names of respondent Linganowda and appellant Siddanowda should be entered in the Barawari in the places of Hanamanthanowda and Channa Siddanowda respectively and that work should be taken from them - No references were produced to prove the allegations of the appellant either as regards the deprivation of the respondent's hak to the Patilki of the village and the conference of the whole of the on Channasiddanowda or ordering to enter in the Barawari only his name - As the respondent Linganowda did not, in obedience to Government orders, conduct the duties of his father's office till the death of Patil Channasiddanowda it cannot be said that he lost his claim thereby. Since Government Proceedings No. 6267-75 dated 3rd January current recently passed R. 105 enjoins that if there are two Hakdar Patils for a village and if both of them

are fit, the names of both of them should be entered in the Register and work taken from both by distributing the work among them, the Authority issued by the Sub-Division officer is Equitable. The said order is confirmed and the appeal preferred by the appellant is dismissed. As regards the apportionment of the work the French Rocks Sub-Division officer and the Amildar should make Suitable arrangement.

15-6-94. Sd. A. Ramaswami Ayyar

that the Mississippi Valley Trust
Company by reason of said Trust
of the Estate of Thomas Shaw had
failed to comply with the provisions of
the Charter of the Company, that the
Directors of said Company were
illegally elected, that the Charter
to Company should be forfeited,
that Company should be dissolved and
that receivers should be appointed
to settle the affairs of the Company
and wind up the business of the
Company. The Mississippi Valley Trust
Company filed its answer to the Attorney
General's petition denying that it
had violated the laws of the State
and that the Charter of the Company
should be forfeited on the grounds
stated in the petition. The Attorney
General filed a reply to the answer
of the Company and the cause was
submitted to the Court upon the
pleadings and evidence introduced
by the parties.

The Court found the issues
to the Company and in
1903. Afterwards the Company
complied with the provisions of the

9

Petition No: 3544 Dist 25/5/95

Petitioner — Siddi Sunda
Patil of Sadra Sarvadnakar
Umraja Taluka, Surat District

— Subject —

Requesting that the decision of
Govt on 12/2/95 with regard to
the Patil of the above Village should
be revised in view of the
Sanadi Agent's G.O.

In the year 1857 there were two
Patils in the Village of Sarvadnakar.
They were Chanda Siddi Sunda,
(father of the late Siddi Sunda) and
~~Jussay~~ Jussay Dayi Sunda.
The latter died in May 1857. The
Subadar submitted a report of
his death to the Subadar with,
(A).
comment stating the intes of the
District Supt in the matter, giving
that the surviving patil should
perform the duties. ~~of the late~~
~~Dayi Sunda~~ From 1857 till
1875-76 Chanda Siddi Sunda was
alone
performing the duties of Patil.
In 1875-76 Col: Shil instructed
the Patils (2 in no), and directed
that Siddi Sunda's (late) Sheristadar

Let the arrangement
made by the Govt
~~be sanctioned~~ for
year 2 the result
reported favourably
is decided regarding
memorialist the claims
mentioned in the petition
of both the Patils must
be given effect to
11.11.98
4/4/96
X. Petr admits this in his memorial.

Rec'd 10/4/96 -
Petn's deputy
Ramanbhai Khushal
10/4
Rec'd 10/4
Petn's deputy
10/4

Draft
DMN
13/4

(A) Asstt. Collr report No: 660 dt 3 17.1.96
(Authenticated copy of which is filed)

X. Asstt Collr's report No: 1489 dt 12/8 8.98

⊗ Order No: 1460 d/d 4.8.83.

x do:

x No: 464 d/d 12.2.84

o. No: 292 Endorsement order d/d 14/2/84

⊗ No: 447 d/d 26/27.3.85

Sub-Division officer on 30.6.83 who sanctioned ⊗ it thereby the responsibility on the Amildar. The Sub-Division officer also wanted to see the parties in person when he went to Mundga. The Amildar x reported that he had ordered the parties to be present; but the Sub-Divn. officer's order No: 451 of 23.2.84 shows that though he waited for ten days the parties did not turn up.

On 14.2.84 Linga Jowda presented a petn. to the Sub-Division officer asking for the Pateli. The Sub-Divn. officer o ordered that the matter should be brought to his notice through the Amildar. Linga Jowda then presented three petns. to the Amildar on 22/7/84, 16/8/84 and 20/9/84. The Amildar then submitted a report No: 64 d/d 12/3/85 saying that the Divn. Comr's order directed that Linga Jowda's claims should be considered after Channabasa Jowda's death — that now Channa Lidda Jowda wanted the pateli for ⊗ his son — and that therefore it was a fit opportunity to consider the claims of Linga Jowda. The Sub Divn. officer ⊗ ordered — Channa Lidda Jowda is able to perform the duties. The claims of others must only be considered after his death.

drainage the Police in place of
the latter.
In 1876, Liège Gaudin, a son of the
deceased Jantil Mecray Liège Gaudin
applied to the Amildar that the
hereditary Jantile should be given him.
The Amildar submitted a report ⊗ No: 1650 dt 17.8.76.
recommending Liège Gaudin. The
Dy Com.r remarked that the village
was a very small one. The Amildar
then reported that the population
of the Village was 300 and the Revenue
Rs 377 — that there are many Villages
in the Taluk having 2, 3 or 4, Patels —
that the rights of Patels are not
forfeited. The Dy Com.r noted that
one Patel was enough for the Village
and that pet.r Liège's claim
should be considered after the death
of the then Office bearer. The Amilder
again submitted a report ⊗ No: 613
that the difficulties which would
arise on the Office bearer's death
The Dy Com.r ordered that Col: Parker's
order could not be cancelled. Against
this order of the Dy Com.r pet.r Liège Gaudin
appealed to the Bd of Com.rs. This
order was confirmed
On 17th Jan.y
In 1881 Channa Liège Gaudin applied
that as he was old his son should be
appointed as Patel. The Appointment
was also submitted to the

⊗ No: 173 dt 2/5. 5.76

Order No: 1157/1789 dt 2/7. 2. 76

O. No: 265/407 dt 2/7. 6. 76

X No: 83/71 dt 24.7.76

X. Liège Com.r's order No: 91 dt

(2) No: 241. (Translation also file)

and on 12.7.93 decided that Lingâ Jmda and Siddî Jmda (2) shd be paid. Against this order pet^r appealed to the D^t Court in Novr 1893. On 25.11.93 the appeal pet^n was rejected as being out of time. He on 11.12.93 presented another appeal pet^n assigning reasons for the delay in presenting it. This pet^n was admitted. The Depy Com^r after hearing the advocates of both parties, confirmed the Asst. Com^r's order on 15.6.94. On 27.8.94 pet^r appealed to Govt. On 12/2/95 Messrs Nanabhai Chellaram and Chunilal Row confirmed the D^t Com^r's order. Mr. Nanabhai Chellaram also ordered that the D^t Com^r should be requested to report for the information of Govt how it is proposed to apportion the duties between both Kakdars.

(1). (Translation also filed)

On 16.3.95, pet^r presented a pet^n to Govt saying that his appeal was disposed of without hearing his advocate and that therefore an opportunity should be given him to represent his case. The 2nd Councillor noted on the pet^n 'Notice? Place this before Mr. J. Chellaram.' The latter wrote — 'Hearing was considered

unnecessary by myself and the Central Govt. I see no sufficient grounds to grant this application. The 2nd Councillor then moved an endorsement accordingly. This letter was accordingly rejected.

On 25th Sept. presented a memorial to Sir Syfurdeen the Maharaja Regent. The grounds, as urged in the new English memorial, for reversing the decision of first are:—

(1) That the revival of another patel was opposed by the order of Col. T. Cant in 1885.

(2) That the appointment of two patels was contrary to the provisions of Survey Settlement which provide only one patel for villages of the size of the villages in question.

(3) That the nomination of a second patel is an invasion of the hereditary rights existing in this family under Native Govt.

(4) That the Govt decisions in favour of Lenja Sudah who ~~has~~ has been out of office for ~~36~~ years are erroneous

(5) That the Sanadabadi Regulations in the Deccan which are the basis for the settlement of the disputed rights of village servants bear

entry all along of the nam
the memorialists' ancestors.

1st Ground — Petr. says that in 185
one Jogi Gowda, brother of the deceas
patel Meesay Linga Gowda, applied
for the patels and that thereupon
the Col: J. Clerk ordered that one
patel was enough for a village.
unauthenticated
Petr. has produced copies of two such
orders which are filed with the record

4th Ground. At the time of Meesay
Linga Gowda's death, his son
Linga Gowda was only 6 years old.
The other two natural-born sons of
the deceased are younger than him
Linga Gowda. From the year 1857
they had no share in the patels.
Channa Siddi Gowda alone was
performing the duties. At the time
in 1888-89
of settlement, Meesay Linga Gowda's heirs
descendants did not raise any objection
because, Linga Gowda says, that as
Channa Siddi Gowda was able, their
claims could not be urged.

5th Ground — The Barabalati
Register of 1865 contains only the
name of Channa Siddi Gowda.
But in the patels Andani Register
of Bramadeeva (1853-54) both
the names of Channa Siddi Gowda

D Anilan's report No: 1650
of 17.1.76.

and Mussay Leiji Swadeshi are mentioned.

It will be remembered that the Dy Comr was asked to report how he proposes to apportion the duties between the two Talukas. The Dy Comr wrote ⊗ to the Sub-Divn Offices on 18/3/95. ⊗ No: 1636 of 18/3/95. (22/3/95)

The Sub-Divn Offices wrote ✕ to the Amildar asking him which of the two ways — appointing one as Revenue Patil and the other as Police Patel, or asking each to work by rotation — he would recommend. The Amildar sent his reply ✕ — There are no Thotis here to perform exclusively police or revenue duties. They the same Thotis will have to perform both duties. These two patils are not on good terms with each other. Therefore if one is appointed as Revenue Patil and the other as police patil, both would require the services of the same Thotis. Thus the work of each dept would suffer and the Thotis would be put to much inconvenience. Therefore the patils may be ordered to perform the Sarkar duties together; or they may be asked to work by rotation for a period of 2 or 3 years each.

✕ No: 804 of 1/4/95.

✕ No: 781 of 4.4.95

The Sub-Divn Offices wrote ○ to the Dy Comr that each man might be ordered to work by turns for two years at

○ No: 999 of 11.4.95

17

@ No: 1571 Pg 19/23 . 4 . 95

X . No: 1526-35 Pg 21 . 94 (Nov)
R . 1005

X No: 438 Pg 1695 (Nov 94)

C . No: 782 Pg 8/12 . 6 . 95

a time. The 4th Court affirmed the said decree & Court. Hereon the 2nd Counter raised on 11.5.95 a Petition of Court of January 95 does not Contemplate the charging of Fees by Vakeels. The Deputy Commissioner should endeavour to ascertain the work as said above in Case 30 & the said order and report the Court." The 1st Court again wrote to the Subdn Court. Subdn Court replied. The Subdn Court replied asking the Petitioner what Rules are the assigned to each Pleader. The Petitioner submitted his reply No: 4/20 Pg 3.7.95 in duly —

I do not think the work could be easily apportioned because every case had is separately inasmuch the same Vakeel has to prepare all the Papers. It would be very convenient if a Court could order that the Vakeels are to prepare all the Papers & Plans together and if & they the account with the petitioner that only one man or a time should receive the money & the vakeel —. The Sub-Court then ordered that the Vakeels should be provided separate Plan on 6/5/95. On 11.5.95 the decided as follows: — In accordance with Sec. 35 Court Proceedings 1894 Court & decided that Court Fees

should [illegible] the Revenue Note and Siddi Fonda Estate Duties. The Postal is the authorised agency between the two. (No: 215 dd 5/15. J. 95). The D.C. Cuttack then wrote — "The Sub-Division Officer of Kendrapara Opines that if the two Estates Siddi Fonda may be made the Revenue Paid and Siddi Fonda Deposit Paid, regarding the Postal Note Endorsements of the Office agency between them. Since the rates have been changed the Rules of the Office Agency, we urge that the Postal Note ⊗ There is nothing on record to show that Siddi Fonda intended the Revenue Paid. [illegible] 6/4/95.

[illegible] Siddi Fonda [illegible]

The D.C. Cuttack vide letter No: 1173 dd 2/5/96 Says that Siddi Fonda personally represented to him that he should be made the Revenue Paid.

A.S. 27/3/96

may be Completed with the Revenue Stamps. The Rly. Secretary has ordered that the Statements which seem to have been taken from both parties as regards the appointment of Rules, should also be sent for." No such statements seem to have been taken nor have any been received.

A.S. 19/2/96

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1894

No. 646

Name of Petitioner. Gaddam Gowda

Village.

Taluk. Bangalore

District.

Date of Arzi. 27-8-94

Date of Receipt. 27-8-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Two

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the judgment of the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore in Revenue Miscellaneous No. 26 of 93-94 on the following grounds.

1. The Respondent has no right to sue if he had any, his claim is barred by limitation

2. During the life-time of the Appellant's father, the Appellant's brother was registered as Patel in 1882 & the Appellant has also now acted as the Patel & he alone was entrusted with the collection of the Govt. dues.

3

3. The village, Pookhajanimacha Ky, Jaunpur
Zilla, has been referred to be a small
one & as such does not require two patels. 20
4. The Deputy Commissioner & the
Jud. Magistrate officer both erred
in appointing the respondent as joint
Patel, & ordering the work to be divided
between them.
5. The appellant & his father & predecessors
have been doing the duties of Patel
for more than 4 generations for nearly
200 years.
6. There is no record to show that
the respondent's father did the duties
of Patel jointly with appellant's father.
7. The respondent's right according to
his own allegation arose in 1857
& he again asserted his right in 1876
& he then denied his right in 1877
& as such he lost all his right
if he had any.

Dated 1918.

15
36
21
73

Pet 618 / 21 / 2088 2852

8-11-

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(3)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

L. R 125-94-2

The accompanying Petition No. 646

dated 27th August 94 received at the

Dewan's Office from Sidda Gowda of

Doddasanduvahalli, Mandya

Taluk appealing against the order

of the Deputy Commr directing him

Petitioner and Linge Gowda to do the duties

late of the Patel of the above named

Village

is forwarded, together with its 2

enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District for submission

of the entire Proceedings relating to

the case

The Petition with its

Enclosures should be returned

By Order,

26/10

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
24th August 1894.

8/11.

26/10

M.G.C.P.,Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

618

22

1895 8826

Pet: 400

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

(9)

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

L.R. 12894-3

Dated 11th
Despatched 12th } January 1895.
Received

Enclosures No. 1 file, with petition and its enclosures.

No. 717

Patel of Dod Garudanahalli

Submits proceedings in connection with Sidde Gowda's appeal petition for the patel

[illegible]

Gent see no reason to interfere with the order issued by the Dy Comr

12/2/95

[illegible]

Put up
14/1

[illegible]
15/1

[illegible]

No.

Enclosures No.

23

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated 11/12 January 1895.

From

A Rangasamy Iyengar Esquire
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Bangalore

SIR.

With reference to your official memorandum Pet/618, dated 8 November 1894, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire proceedings relating to the appeal preferred by Sidde gowda of Doddagarudanahalli, Nandya Taluk, regarding the Patéli hook of the same Village, together with a translation of the Canarese order passed in the case.

2. The petition, and its enclosures, received with the above, are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Compd.
ulq



24

646 R
27-8-94

2

(1)

In the court of Highness The Maharaj
of Mysore, Bangalo
Revenue Miscellaneous Appeal No.
A.S. 39 of 1894-95

Siddaygowda - Appellant

Lingay Gowda - Respondent.

The Appellant abovenamed begs to appeal to this Honorable Court against the Judgement of the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore in Revenue Miscellaneous No. 26 of 93-94, on the following grounds:-

1. The Respondant has no right and even if he had any, his claim is barred by law of Limitation.

2. During the lifetime of the Appellants father the Appellant has been recognised and registered as Patel in 1882, and the Appellant has a son aged 20 who is able to read and write, and who now assists the Appellant in the collection

of

3. The village has been erected to be a small one and no such notice as the two hotels.

4. The regular communications and such Division offices have used in advising the Regiment at Saint Patel, and relaying the work to be divided between them.

5. The appellant and his parties and his ancestors have been using the Division of Patel for more than 4 generations for nearly 200 years.

6. There is no record to show that the Respondents parties visit the Division of Patel during the Appellant's time.

7. The Respondents appeal according to his own allegation accrued in 1875 and the Appellant asserted his right in 1876 and he was denied his right in 1877 and as such it was out all his right in the land suit.

Bangalore
27.8.94

Respondent
Advocate for Respondent

No. 223

26

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 27-6-62 [illegible]

[illegible] 223 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1993-94 [illegible] 26

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 12-9-93 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1657

[illegible]

Page

27

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪಿಎಸ್‌ಸಿ/ಸಿಆರ್‌ಎಂ/ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಸಿ/೨೦೨೪-೨೫/೧೨೭೬

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಮಾಂಡೆಂಟ್,
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಶಸ್ತ್ರ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಪಡೆ, ೭೭ನೇ ಬೆಟಾಲಿಯನ್,
ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ.

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಸಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇವರ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಇಎ/ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಸಿ/೨೦೨೪/೫೫೦೨, ದಿನಾಂಕ ೦೮-೦೫-೨೦೨೪.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವು ೨೦೨೪ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಸಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೫ ರಿಂದ ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ೦೬ ರವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದು, ಫಲಿತಾಂಶವನ್ನು ಮೇ ೦೮ ರಂದು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದೆ. ಈ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ೭,೪೨,೩೧೬ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ೫,೯೧,೨೦೪ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಾರೆ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣತಾ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಶೇ. ೭೯.೮೨ ರಷ್ಟಿದೆ.

ಈ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೧೨,೪೫೬ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಪ್ರಥಮ ದರ್ಜೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನವರು ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದವರಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಅವರ ಕುಟುಂಬಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಮೊದಲ ಬಾರಿಗೆ ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಸಿ ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಿದ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಕೂಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೇ ಓದಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರುವುದು ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಪೋಷಕರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿನಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಸಾಧನೆಯನ್ನು ಗುರುತಿಸಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಪೋಷಕರ ಹೆಸರು, ವಿಳಾಸ ಮತ್ತು ಮೊಬೈಲ್ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮೇ ೨೦ ರೊಳಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ,

ಆಪ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರ
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

Dag

[illegible]

[illegible] 10267-75 / 1055 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 15 [illegible] 1894

[illegible]

M G Krishnaiya

[illegible]

కంగరంలు క్ష కాంరంకు: 27- 6- 94

కాంశలు-----కాంరంకు: 30 3- 7- 94

కాంరాంపత్రి కాంరంకు 5- 7- 94

భూంశ్యనభనం ఖ్యే 620

రాంరాలు — 0 - 7 - 0

కంశీలక్ష్మి 0 - 1 - 2

శీలంకే 0 - 0 - 4

0 - 8 - 6

శ్రీనివాసరావుగారి లాభ
కాంలుకు





IN THE ~~CHIEF~~ COURT OF ~~MYSORE~~ BANGALORE

of 1894-95

NO

Appellant

I the ~~Appellant~~ above named do hereby retain Mr. S. Ramaswamy Iyer as Advocate to appear and conduct the above case in the said Court on my behalf—

And I agree to be bound by all his acts and pleadings in the said case

Accepted

Advocate. for

Sable Gondola con ojo Cáscara

Sable Gondola con cáscara Langosta

con Langosta Gondola con Arenas. o

Arena con Salamanca Sin recorte

Recortes en Mano Langosta Gondola

con Langosta Gondola Estable Sin

Sin Sin otro Cáscara con Cáscara

Este Oficio Sin Sin Cáscara Sin Sin

Considera en sin Cáscara Sin Cáscara

Sable Gondola con Cáscara Sable Gondola

Sin Arena, Sin Sin Sable Gondola Cáscara

Bajo de Sable en Sin Cáscara

Sable Langosta Gondola con Cáscara en Sin

Otro Gondola Cáscara Langosta Gondola Sin

Bajo de Sable en Sin Cáscara Sin

Sin Sable Gondola

Sable
2014

No. 646 P.

35

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT, (5)

17th February 1895

Endorsement granted to Lidde Gowda of Doddagaguvana halli, Mandya Taluk, Nagara Dt

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 646 dated 27 Augt. 1894 appealing against the Dy. Commrs order directing both Petitioner and Linge Gowda D do the duties of Patel of the above named village.

Petitioner is informed that Govt. see no reason D interfere with the order issued by the Dy. Commr.

2/ The Enclosures are returned.

By order.

4/3/95

L.R. 125-94-A

No. 14611 / P. 1230 d/17.2.95 — Chief Secretary.

14/3

Copy D the Dy. Commr. Mysore District returning the Proceedings received with his letter No. 717 dated 11th January 1895, with a request that he will report for the information of Govt how it is proposed D apportion the duties between both Patelars.

"By Order"

4/3/95

for Chief Secretary.

Draft

Council order

13/2

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-3-91.—2000.

14/2

(6)

Gen. 31.] Reg. No. 576

15.4.95

189 5

37

From

16/4/95

L.R 125-94-6

To The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated 11.4.95

Despatched 12

Received 15.4.95

General No. 999
No.

Enclosure No. Vile

Submitting memorandum
Amildar's report No 781;
4th instant regarding the
apportionment of duties
to the patels of Doddajura-
damahally Manuja talu

The Division Office
French Rocks
Dated 11th April 189

From

K. Mohamad Ali Esqr
The Division Office
French Rocks

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District
Mysore

Sir

With reference to your Mem
No 636 dated 18th Ultimo regarding
appointment of duties to Patel
Dodjaundanahully Mundya I
I have the honor to submit here
Mundya Amildars report No 78
4th instant for your information
I agree with the Amildar in his
suggestion to appoint the Pat
to discharge the duties for

x not found up
BR

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸಿಆಸುಇ 95 ಸಿಎಸ್‌ಪಿ

14-3-95

1895. (10)

14346.

Pet. 574

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

Govt

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

L.R. 125-94

Dated 18
Despatched 23 } April 95
Received

Enclosures No. 1

No. 1171

States that the two patels of Doddagarudanhalli may be directed to work for 2 years by rotation.

Sub: to the Rev. Lewis Ellen.

In giving his decision in a dispute between two individuals named Siddegowda & Linegowda regarding the Patels of Doddagarudanhalli Hobli, Malur Talook, the Dy Comm^r ordered, with reference to Govt Ord: 10267-75 dated 3rd January 1894, R. 1055 that the Hakdar should be taken from the Hakdars & that as regards the apportionment of it the Sub Dy Comm^r should make a suitable arrangement. The appeal of Siddegowda to Govt was dismissed & communicating this order the Dy Comm^r was asked to intimate if it was proposed to apportion duties between both Hakdars.

The Sub Dy Comm^r & the Dy Comm^r recommend that each Hakdar ordered to do the duties for 2 years rotation.

A copy of the Govt order of 3rd Jany 1894 is sent.

10/5

Memorandum dated 3rd January 1894 does not contemplate the changing of duties by rotation. The Dy Comm^r should dispose of the matter as he thinks fit.

Pet. 2574

Recd from Rev: Bowden on 2/5/95

Pet. 2362

(after Pet^r has heard by the Rev. Lewis Ellen).

Other file to be made of papers and copy ordered 11/5

after 10 days

3/5

Draft Govt 11/5

11/5/95

30.4.95

No.

Enclosures No.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore 18 April 18

From

A Rangasamy Iyengar Esquire
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Government of Mysore.
Bangalore

SIR.

With reference to your no 14611, dated 14th October 1890, regarding the disturbed disputes between the two patels of Doddagahalli, Mandya Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith letter no 999, dated 11 Instant, from the Sub division officer, Ma Dodda No, (in original), and, for the reasons mentioned in that letter, to recommend that a rotation of 2 years, for each Patel, may be approved.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Chikkanna Mudaliar
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore

Compd.
Mly.

39

a record of Cycles respectively in rotation

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Subdivision Officer
French Rocks

I agree with S.D.O. in recommending that a return of 24 hrs may be approved
A.R.
17

Proposal for Grant of Power

(11)

Read letter no. 1741 11-1 dated April 1895 from the Commr. Chirpur forwarding the Petition of Kedarnath Khetawat for ~~cancellation~~ Renewal of Licence for Country Liquor shop at Kekri for the year 1895-96.

Also read letter no. 4011/1230 dated 17th Feb. 1895 from Excise Commr. Ajmer forwarding the Petition of Kedarnath Khetawat for ~~cancellation~~ Renewal of Licence for Country Liquor shop at Kekri for the year 1895-96.

L.R. 128-96-8

Under Section 11 of Act XXI of 1871 ~~No. 21180~~ 11-5-95 23.

The Order of Govt of 4th January 1894 does not contemplate the changing of terms of Contracts. The Excise Commr. should endeavour to distribute the work as laid down in para 3 of the said order and report accordingly.

15/5/95

Draft. Secy: Chief Secy
Regd
Sent 15/5

To Secy. Excise Commr Ajmer

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

646 of 194
Memo No 1464 of 95/95
1283

[Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895

No: 3544

Name of Petitioner. Siddappa [illegible]

Village. [illegible]

Taluk. [illegible]

District. [illegible]

Date of Arzi. 25 - 5 - 95

Date of Receipt. 27 - 6 - 95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

Memorandum to [illegible] the Decision [illegible] Commissioner [illegible] report [illegible] against the decision [illegible] Patil [illegible] to him by Government [illegible] No 646 of 17-2-95

[illegible]
[illegible] K. S.
24/6/95

[illegible] 2/7

The [illegible]
11/7

Sub. to the Rev. Commissioner with [illegible]
The order complained of was passed by the 1st Commissioner & the Hon'ble [illegible] Rao Pantulu in February last.
Appn. for review of that order was rejected in April last as [illegible] the 1st & 2nd Commissioners.
This Memo. [illegible]

Regist.
12/7

Here is a translation of the judgment of the Commissioner. The [illegible] had been [illegible] –

Ask the Dy. Comr. to report the arrangement which has been finally effected in this matter

3.7.95

Draft recd. 4
13 – 7 – 95
13/7

Recd. 16
Drafted
16/7

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. N.A. 3574 M
DATE 27-6-95

To
His Highness the Maharaja
Sri Mum Raja Wadiyar Bahadur
Ruling Prince
Mysore

Vol II 6 W
1

The humble memorial of Linge
gowdah of Doddagarudahalli
Hobli in Nagamangala Taluk Mysore District

May it please your Highness

That the memorialist's father
Channadodegowdah was Patel of the
said village the office having continued
in his family for two centuries past
as borne out by the Kandaya of Sixteen Fanam
in his possession. In 1867, one Hire-
Gowdah, who was jointly doing
the duties with the memorialist's father,
died, and then the deceased's brother
Jogegowdah's application to be appointed
as successor to the deceased was reject-
ed by Col. K. Clerk the Comr of the Nala-
tagram Division, on the ground that
only one Patel sufficed as the village
was small.

That since then the memorialist's
father remained the only Patel for the
village. In 1876 the said Hire Linge
gowdah's son Linegowdah urged his
claims to succeed his late father as
Patel but they were discountenanced
by the Hy Comr an order having been
passed

× Jogegowdah's petition dt 14 Dec 1867 & 20th Dec 1867 & the last thereon.

passed by him in much the same terms as the order of Col. Clerk in 1887. The said Langegowdah reasserted his claims in 1892 and the then Amildar Lingappa very strongly the same the then District Officer backed on to his predecessor's order a clause that the claimant Langegowdah's case would receive consideration after the existing Patels lifetime

That thus provided with a hold to enforce a different Office and to nullify the original order of the District Court in 1887, Langegowdah waited for a fitting opportunity. Accordingly in 1893 the Memorialist's father died and the Memorialist applied for his name to be substituted as Patel of the village. Correspondence ensued between the Sub: Div Officer and the Amildar, and in spite of the protestations of the latter that only one Patel did well all along for a period of 86 years, and that associating another with the Patel already existing, small as the village is, would lead to friction hampering the performance of Govt work, the former appointed both the Memorialist and Langegowdah as Patels.

That the Memorialist appealed against this to the Dy Comr but he concurred in the decision of the Sub Division Officer. He lodged a further appeal to the Government in

F.91-94

(13)

L.R. 125-94-10

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 3544 dated 25-5-95 addressed to H.H. the Maharaja ~~received at the Dewan's Office from~~ Siddi Gowda of Doddagarudanahalli Mandya Taluk, ~~copy and extract from G.O. dated~~ ~~in G.O. No. 39 of 94-95 regarding~~ other matter in dispute of Patels of Nelvidage is forwarded, together with its one enclosures, to the Dy. Comm. Mysore District, with reference to this Govt. Proceeding No: 21180 Pet. 7.91-94 dated 11th May 1895, with a request that he will be pleased to ~~for~~ report ~~of~~ the arrangement which has been finally effected in this matter.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned

Order,
18.7.95

Chief Secretary

BANGALORE,
18-7-1895

M.G.C.P.H.—19-2-95—.

A 6467/17
February 1895
(enclosed)
Order passed by the Hon'ble
Chief Commissioner
Commissioner's Memorial
Order of Commissioner
Order of Court
Order of Revision
Order of Appeal
(8)

on August last and the Commissioner directed a Rule to be issued as prayed the Memorialist to Lahaina a hearing as is usually done in all such cases summarily issued an Exparte to the effect that Justice no reason to interfere with the orders of the Dy Comr.

That thus defeated in his attempt to obtain justice the Memorialist with humble submission kneels down before the sacred throne of his Sovereign and most respectfully begs to this appeal to your Highness on the following grounds humbly trusting that the Royal pleasure will condescend to do him that justice for which he has been vainly seeking these three years at great expense and inconvenience to the unavoidable neglect of cultivation, the means of his subsistence:—

1 That the recent another Patel was appointed to the order of Colonel Clerk in 1867

2 That the appointment of two Patels was contrary to the Survey Policy, rules which prescribe only one Patel for villages of the size of the village in question

3 That the nomination of a 2nd Patel to an invasion of the Memorialists hereditary right vesting in him by virtue of Sepoy Sultan's Sanad

4. That the Dy Comrs assumes in favor of Lunsendale who as shown above has been out of office for 3 6 years are erroneous and

(6)

5 That the Bara Baloota Registers in the Taluk which are the basis for the settlement of the disputed rights of village Servants bear entry all along of the names of the Memorialists ancestors

The Memorialist as in duty bound shall ever pray

Bangalore
25th May 1896

Inamdar of Seddigondah
Patel of Seddigondanahalli
Kasaba Taluk

57

GOVERNMENT OF ARIZONA

received with your no Pet 7 of the 18th July 1895
91.94
is, together with its enclosure, herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant.

[signature]
Dy Commissioner
of the Impr. District

Compd.
Wly.

[Gen. 31.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 3373
No.
1895
25 OCT 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE

14

14

459

From The Deputy Commissioner
Office Mysore District

To The Revenue Secretary to the Government of Mysore

L.R. 123-74-11

Dated 23d October 1895

Despatched

Received

General No.

No. 492

Enclosure No. Nil.

Reports about the decision of the Policy of Doddajarudana Palli in the Nanjya Taluk.

Call for the Record, Cancelled with the correspondence that can be read under Section 62 of the Land Revenue Code. The Assistant Commissioner will have full notice from both parties as regards the selection of Pattadar. Nothing else is necessary. Order issued.

6/11/95

Peter
M
25/10/95

Sub-proceedings with reference to the above noted order are herewith submitted.

The Memorial addressed by Subbaka & H. the Pattadaran (Respondent 2) for disposal - is a Duplicate Memorial addressed by them to the Assistant Commissioner, the Memorial of the Petitioners, the Pattadaran has stated that there is only trifling Personal Property, but addressed there Petty, Pattadaran has Referred to this effect by the Petitioners. There is a Translation of the Memorial under the Seal of the Assistant Commissioner & the Pattadaran

25/10

P.791-94.

Gen. 31

1896 6024 Ref 579

DEWAN'S OFFICE 16

L.R. 125-94-13

From The Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District

To The Revenue Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 6"

Despatched February 1896

Received

General No.

No. 955

Enclosure No. Records.

Submitting the vernacular correspondence regarding the apportionment of the patels duties of Doddagarudanahalli in the Maddur taluk

Petition Branch.

BB

10/2/96

Submitted

15/2

Dy Commissioners office
Impone District

No 955.
Ele. Records.

Dated Impone 6th Febreary 1896

To

The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Impone

Sir,

As required in your docket no 4443/P.791-94 dated the 7th November 1895 and reminders noted in the margin, I have the honor to submit herewith the vernacular record returned with your office memorandum no 14611/P 1230 dated 14th February 1895 as also the correspondence that took place subsequently, between this office, the French Rocks Sub division officer, and the Amildar of the Mandya taluk regarding the apportionment of the patéli duties of Dodda Gaurdanahalli in that taluk.

F 791-94-95 no Pet F 791-94 dated 31st January 1896

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient Servant.

Dy Commissioner
of the Impone District

Compd:
tly.

5-0

No. 492 Ely. F.

The Deputy Commissioner's office
Anjore District
Dated Anjore 23d October 1895

From

The Dy Commissioner
of the Anjore District

To

The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir

With reference to Government order
No 21180 / Pet 791-94 of 11th May 1895 and your reminders
No. Pet 7 / 91-94 dated the 15th July 1895 and Pet / 805 of the
20th October 1895, calling for a report about
the division of the office of Potêly of Dodda-
Jarudanahalli in the Mandya Taluk between
the 2 Claimants thereto, I have the honor to
state that the Sub Division officer of French
Rocks opines that, Linga gowda (of the two claimants)
the Revenue potêl and Lidde gowda the
Police Potêl, they dividing the Batage or the
Emoluments of the office equally between them.
But as the latter has been doing all the
duties of the office himself, he begs that he
may be made the Revenue potêl. I think that
his request may be complied with.

2 The petition of Lidde gowda &c

(15)

52

To

Nedgaon Commissioner
Nagpur District

L.R. 125-96-12

No. 4442 / 87-11-95.
No. 91-94 / 11

Rec: 2nd

Ref letter No. 4442 dated 23rd Sept 1895 stating that Sheikh Sonda of Dori Gondankari, Sironja Taluk, may, as desired by him, be made an Revenue Patil of that village, and Lingo Sonda, the Police Patil.

With reference to the above have the honor to request that the Record returned with this Office No. 470 dated 7th Sept 1895, may be forwarded at this Office as an early date, after both the correspondence that took place between the Commissioner the one D.C. and the Collector. Judgement & the case & that memorandum and the Proceedings given by the parties & Witness the application of the said Petition between them.

By order
5-11-95
Asst. Secretary

Dy 6/11

S 7

1896. Pol 6798/577

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
10 MAR 96
DEWAN'S OFFICE

(18)

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
of the Mysore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Dewan of~~ Govt Mysore.
Rev. and Genl. departments

L.R. 125-94-15

Dated 5th
Despatched } March 1896
Received

Enclosures No. Canarese file.

No. 1106

Furnishes the information called for in connection with the patels of Doddagarudanahalli in the Mandya taluk.

Rev. Dep.
9.3.96
Petitioner
DS
9/3/96

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore district

No. 1106.
Ele. Executive file. Dated Mysore 5th March 1896.

To,
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue and General departments

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 7464/97. 91. 94 dated the 19th February 1896, returning the vernacular record relating to the pateli of Doddagaravanahulli in the Mandya taluk, and calling for some information, I have the honor to State as follows: —

2. A Copy of docket No. 195, dated 12th August 1895, received from the Sub division officer of French rocks, apportioning the pateli duties between the two claimants, Linegowda and Siddegowda, is now put up with the record as required. The record is herewith resubmitted.

3. With regard to the observation made in the docket under reply, that the part of the record showing that Siddegowda has been doing all the duties of the pateli since his father's death, has not been put up with the file, I beg to invite your kind reference to the Mandya taluk Amildar's

Draft wanted for reference

(17)

55

L.R. 125-94-142

The Deputy Commr.
Mysore Dt

No. 7464 / C.F. 91-94 dt 19.2.96 Encl: one letter file

His letter No. 955 dated 6th instant submitting the records relating to the Patels of Doddagundakalli, Mandya Taluk

---

With reference to the above he is requested to observe that the file is not complete inasmuch as (1) the docket addressed by the Asst Dist. Officer to the Dy Commr after personally examining the position on the 10th Aug 1895 (vide Asst Dist Officer's Rec 215 dated 13th Idem to the Amildar) and (2) the disposition or order passed in which the necessary action is finally noted. Observation in the Dy Commrs letter No 492 dated 22nd October 1895 was based.

Please note in future that all the papers and records that the file

"that as the latter (Wilde) was then away on tour the District Office Records could not be made use of"

5-6

on the subject and is now with the
Secretary of State, ~~[illegible]~~
~~complete~~ and a full report
will be submitted to the Board
as practicable.

By order

HBL
19/2

JW Secretary
19/2

P.7.91-94

61

Gen. 31

NUS
7217
MAR 9
'S OF
20

1895-96.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Revenue and General Depts

Dated 21st March 1896.

Despatched

Received

General No.

No. 1179

Enclosure No. —

Stating that the statement to the effect that Siddé Gowda wanted the revenue patéli of Dodgarudanahalli in the Mandya taluk was made on the personal representation of the man.

Submitted (with an office note) with reference to 2nd Councillor's order on the petn no: 3544.

31-3-96

31/3/96

L.R. 125-94-17

Rev.
24/3/96

See to the petn of the herbgs.

24/3/96

Petn Sbr

26/3/96

Submitted.
27/3.

No. 1179.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Mysore District
Dated camp Gundlupet 21st
March 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 8369 G.H. 91-94 dated 12th March 1896 enquiring on what ground I stated in my letter No. 492 of the 23rd October 1895 that Siddé Gowda wanted the revenue patéli of the village referred to, I beg to state that I made that statement on the personal representation of the man.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obdt. servant,

Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

report No 145, dated the 12th August 1898.
to the Sub division Officer of Eiruli
Loco in the latter part of which it
is clearly stated that I did journal
was till then the only patel of the
village of in paper No 1 in the file.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

your most obed.t Servt

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner
Mgn of the Nyanza district

Compd
ulu

60

(17)

L.R. 125-94-16

To

The Dy. Comr.
Mysore District

No: 8369 / P.T. 91-94 dt 12-3-96

His letter ~~No: 492 dt 23/10/95~~ and No: 1106 dt 5/3/96 submitting the record relating to the Patel of Doddajarandahalli, Mirasdar Inam

---

With reference to the above he is directed to observe that there is nothing in the record to substantiate the statement ~~in the report dated the~~ made in his letter No. 492 dt 23rd Oct last and request that the required information as per ~~the~~ enquiry ordered in the ~~letter~~ 2nd Govt may be furnished in duplicate at an early date.

By order

Draft

12-3-96

Secretary, Revenue Department

N.S.
12/3/96

x It is not clear in the record that the panel has been made the revenue Patel

(21)

63

Read:

Memorial dated 25th May 1895, received 30th ... from H.H. The Maharani Regent in Cadale ... Patel ... complaining ... the order passed regarding the Patelki of Jaggayyapeta and ... directing suitable apportionment of the duties of the office between both the ... (1) Petitioner Cadale Gowda and (2) ... Gowda.

2. Correspondence ending with letter no. 1170 dated 21st March 1896 from the Dy. Commr. Mysore District, ~~reporting on the petition of Cadale Gowda~~.

Encumbrance file — ... Rs. 9584 E.F. 91-94.

Govt. direct that the order recognising the claims of both the Patels be given effect to. The arrangement proposed by the Dy. Commr (Para 2) that Petitioner ... Gowda

* Rs. [illegible] the expenses incurred in the encumbrance made. Sent Rs. [illegible] Commr. papers and [illegible]

1. Recd. Receipts [illegible]

41 -

L.R. 128-94-18

Should be made Re Revenue Patel and Lunge Grounds

The Police Patel may be carried out and a report submitted after ~~twelve~~ a year

~~and six months reported~~

if any alteration is deemed necessary

(21)

17.4.96

Sec

Q2

Draft. Secy

15/4

To

The Dy. Commr.

Required with records

Asst. to Peh

SUM

15/4

Sec

17-4-96

AS

16/4

No. 3544 Dt. 1

19/11/97

GST

(2)

L.R. 125-96-19

66.

By Order

For Secretary